

[30th January 1923]

Clause 26—cont.

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

At this stage, 1 p.m., the House adjourned for lunch.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m.

IX

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY, 1922.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move that ' the Bill to provide for the reorganization of the Madras University ' as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—" I beg to second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

Clause 1.

Sub-clause (2).

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—" Sir, I have given notice of two amendments in connexion with this clause, and the one is alternative to the other. The first amendment is :

9. *After the words ' on such date or dates ' insert ' after the 1st July 1928 ' ;*

The alternative amendment is :

If the above amendment be not carried, insert in the same place the words ' after the 1st July 1926 '.

On consultation with some of my friends, I thought that I had better not move the first amendment, namely, that which relates to the five years. I therefore wish to confine my observations to the second amendment, namely, that this Act shall come into force on such date or dates after the 1st July 1926. In this amendment I seek to give effect to the idea that is already found in sub-clause (2) of clause 1. The House will notice that the sub-clause as it stands recognizes the possibility of the Act not being brought into force immediately after it is passed into law and that some interval should elapse between the passing of this Act and the bringing into force of its provisions. Now, the effect of my amendment is that this interval shall be a statutory one leaving the discretion of the Government unhampered with respect to the other principles contemplated by this sub-clause.

" As the House is aware, there has been a great deal of controversy with respect to the need for this Bill being passed now and to the Act being in the form proposed by this Bill. It is also to be recognized that the system of reforms which is going to be introduced if the Bill becomes law is one which will require, as I believe the hon. the Minister for Education has already recognized, the outlay of large funds. We want a capable machinery to be brought into existence, and there is also the need that the affiliated colleges contemplated by this Bill should adjust themselves to the new conditions that will arise when this Bill becomes law. I think all these things must of necessity take some time. So far as the Madras University is concerned, it

30th January 1923] [Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar]

Clause 1—cont.

cannot be said that the University is not doing its work properly and therefore for the purpose of ending an evil, a new legislation should be brought into existence at once so that the present evil may be remedied and a better state of things may be introduced. So far as the question of the residential or teaching University goes, I believe it was recognized that if it is possible to introduce such a system it is eminently desirable that it should be so done and it is because this House has recognized that it is so that leave was given for the introduction of this Bill and that it has also passed the Select Committee stage. But it has also to be recognized that when a University is brought into existence on the new model, it has to be enabled to discharge its duties in an adequate manner and to the full satisfaction of all concerned. I therefore submit that it must take some time to arrange the new conditions under which alone the new University can work, and what is more important than all, it will take some time for finding the funds. As I already said, the affiliated colleges have to some extent adjust themselves in the light of the new requirements of the Bill. In these circumstances the prescribing of a statutory interval will show them that they have some time allowed within which they can adjust themselves to the changed conditions of the University.

"The other point that I would like to emphasize is this: We show by passing this Bill into law what the ideal that we like to approximate to is and we put everybody that is concerned on notice that that goal shall have to be approximated to within an interval of time which, I submit, is not a very long one, and we shall be only carrying out the intentions of this Bill if effect is given to the amendment that I suggest. The Government will have enough time to provide the necessary funds for the new machinery and the University will have adequate time given to it for adjusting itself to the requirements of this Bill. Above all, the affiliated colleges may also know how exactly they have to improve themselves if they wish to become University centres.

"There is also one other matter which I may mention in this connexion, viz, the position of the intermediate colleges. It will be observed that the object of the University is to divest itself, sooner or later, of the control over the intermediate colleges or institutions which prepare candidates for entrance into the University. The time I am suggesting will enable the intermediate colleges to remodel themselves so as not to stand any longer in need of the control of the University and will also enable the Local Government to devise another machinery by which they or some other authority can make themselves sure that those who enter the University are persons who are eligible for it. For these reasons I strongly commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I beg to second this amendment. It is quite clear from the Bill that sufficient time must elapse before the necessary steps are taken for the constitution of the various bodies which are to make the University and to bring them into working order. The period of three years suggested in this amendment is, I submit, a reasonable one taking into account all the discussions that took place regarding the question as to when the Bill should be brought into force. I

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [30th January 1923]

Clause 1—cont.

should also point out that the acceptance of this amendment will also necessitate consequential amendments which will have to be considered. It is on the supposition that this Bill will be put into operation at an early date that provision was made in clause 46, clause 47 and some other clauses for the constitution, for the framing of the rules and for the bringing into existence of the various bodies which are to work side by side. But these are matters of detail which ought not to stand in the way of this amendment being accepted. For these reasons I heartily support this amendment."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to oppose this amendment. The clause, as it stands, was considered by this House; it was also well considered by the Select Committee; and it has come back from the Select Committee in the same form. I do not therefore see any good reason for the amendment which is now proposed.

2-45 p.m. "The hon. the mover and the seconder of this amendment have not furnished any new ground for making the alteration. Secondly, it was said that affiliated colleges must adjust themselves and that this would take some time. If they understand the provisions of the Bill, the affiliated colleges stand in the same relation to the University as they have been till now and there will be no disturbance of their status or relationship to the University. I do not, therefore, see any reason assigned by the mover and the seconder for the amendment. This is only an objection that is naturally raised in all cases when a new Bill is brought for consideration before the House, and even if the Government of India Bill were to be brought again, the Opposition, I am sure, would say that a particular class of people have to adjust themselves to the altered circumstances and that therefore the Bill should be postponed or should be brought into effect some five or ten years after. Such objections we should think are unreasonable and absurd. Nothing sound has been put forward to say that this Bill should be postponed. I think that this is one of the ways in which Bills are sought to be consigned to the waste paper basket and I can only consider this motion as one of the obstructive tactics and nothing else. I therefore strongly oppose the motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I must say at the outset of a discussion of a most important measure affecting the reorganization of the University, I am sorry that my hon. friend should have taken the liberty of characterising this proposal as 'obstructive tactics' and as 'absurd' and that he should have used other, what I may call, unparliamentary expressions."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. Charging one another as obstructive is not at all unparliamentary."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I am aware of it, Sir. If I considered it so unparliamentary as to need the intervention of the Chair, I would certainly have got up then and there. But I used the expression 'unparliamentary' in the broader sense of courtesy to each other in debates. I am sure my hon. friend was certainly unparliamentary in the broad sense of not showing consideration to any proposal which came from those who differed from him.

30th January 1923] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Clause 1—cont.

“ Having said so much, by way of regret at the temper with which my hon. friend has received this proposal, I shall proceed to say a few words in support of the proposal. In the first place, we have contended, and we have very rightly contended, that the whole position of intermediate education is left unsolved and that this Bill proceeds on the assumption that this question has to be settled in the future. Therefore, the question arises as to what exactly is the position of the Intermediate colleges under the Bill. This question was raised in the Select Committee and my hon. friend said that this clause was considered in this House. I should like to know what he means. Perhaps what he meant to say was that this was not challenged clause by clause. My hon. friend will remember that this question of the position of the intermediate colleges was raised in the earlier part of the debate on this Bill and I still submit that one of the really intricate questions that arises in connexion with the Bill is that relating to the position of the intermediate colleges. What will be the position immediately after this Bill comes into operation? I find that my hon. friend went to Berhampur as reported in the newspapers and informed the college authorities there—I speak subject to correction—that they would have to reduce the intermediate colleges into high schools. If such an order is to be issued under this Bill, is it not necessary, I ask, that the authorities of the colleges should be given time either to reduce the colleges into high schools or to raise them to first-grade institutions.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ The hon. gentleman should have verified the statement before hazarding it. If the hon. Member is to make a responsible statement, I expect him to verify it before stating it in this responsible assembly.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ The verification is to make the statement in the presence of the hon. the Minister and ask him whether he made it.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Many untrue statements will be made and they should be verified.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I do not wish to pursue that matter. I told the hon. the Minister that I read in the newspapers a report of what he said at Berhampur and the hon. the Minister could have said whether that was correct or not. That is the only way of verifying the statement. I shall ask my hon. friend to apply the substance of that proposal to himself. Are we now, as soon as this Bill comes into force, to tell all these authorities to reduce the institutions to high schools or promote them to first-grade institutions? If this change with reference to many of the institutions is to take place, I should ask my hon. friend to consider whether that does not require some amount of notice to the educational authorities. After all, three years are not very long so as to justify the proposal being called obstructive tactics. It is a reasonable notice to these authorities of what they ought to do under the altered circumstances. My hon. friend then made some reference to the Government of India Act. I think the reference was rather irrelevant and I do not like to add more irrelevant references to it.”

[30th January 1923]

Clause 1—cont.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, is it parliamentary to use the expression 'irrelevant'?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Certainly, it is parliamentary. I would submit myself to the ruling of the Chair."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is parliamentary to charge a member as being irrelevant. That is what I do on many occasions when rising to order."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I trust that the discussion on this Bill will proceed in a thoroughly businesslike manner and that my hon. friend will receive our criticisms in the light in which he ought to receive. I tell him with great respect and with great anxiety that all these colleges which will be affected by this measure are entitled to sufficient notice. If my hon. friend thinks that it is not necessary, I also take the liberty of telling him that he is wrong."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I wish to oppose this motion. With considerable respect to all my predecessors, I must say that a considerable amount of unnecessary heat has been imported into the discussion of this amendment and I shall say a few words on this motion, without importing any heat into it. My hon. friend, Mr. Govindaraghava Ayyar, evidently wants to put off the operation of this Bill after it becomes law. Evidently, he does not like that the Bill should be passed into law and as such the course he has adopted of moving for the postponement of the operation of the Bill is perfectly right. I submit, Sir, that this Council has already adopted the main principles of the Bill when it came for discussion before it was sent to the Select Committee. All that is now left to us is to adjust the details. Seeing that the Council is for the Bill as a whole, I think it is perfectly unnecessary to put off its operation to a period of more than three and a half years as is proposed in the amendment. The main argument that has been advanced by my hon. friends who are in favour of this amendment is that some time must be given to the colleges for adjusting themselves to the new situation. In one way or another this Bill has been before the public for several months and in any case there are provisions in this Bill which are called transitory provisions for meeting difficulties that may arise after the present Act governing the University ceases to operate and before the new one is brought into effect. During this transitory period, when these provisions will be operative these colleges will have enough time to adjust themselves to the new surroundings. I have been carefully following the arguments of my hon. friends, Krishna Rao and Govindaraghava Ayyar, and I am sorry to say that I have not at all been convinced by them. With these observations, I wish to associate myself with those who oppose the amendment."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I should like to say just a word or two about the points raised by Mr. Ramachandra Rao. He said that the position of the intermediate colleges had not been settled, and so it was too early to bring this Bill into operation. In clause 35 of the Bill it is said that admissions to the University will be made at the stage of the Intermediate Examination in Arts. So the position of the intermediate colleges is not affected at all. But I admit they may be said to be affected in this way. They are now under the University, and the question to be

30th January 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

Clause 1—cont.

decided hereafter will be whether they will continue under the University or under some other authority. Clause 36 says that it is only after a satisfactory controlling authority has been brought into existence that the control of the University will cease. So, Sir, I do not see what sort of objection can be raised with reference to second-grade colleges. I beg to submit that the argument that their future is not settled and that they are left in a state of speculation does not hold good. I believe I am right in saying that in Allahabad, the Intermediate Education Bill followed the University Bill and did not precede it. So the natural course for us also would be to make arrangements for the University organization and then to make arrangements for entrance into the University. The Intermediate Examination is considered as the entrance to the University. So I take it that there is an implied promise contained in clause 36 that a Bill will follow to make provision for intermediate education. So we need not entertain any apprehension regarding the future of the institutions.

“Then the only other thing will be whether the Bill itself is good or not. If it is a good one, I suppose we should not lose time in bringing it into force. We have in all conscience lost much time already and the complaint and the feeling everywhere has been that our University education is anything but satisfactory and ought to be brought up to the level prevailing elsewhere. If we pass the Bill and wait for two or three years we are losing valuable time and any advantage that we may expect from the Bill will to that extent be lost. So, Sir, it is only those who think that the Bill is not a good one that can support the amendment. I have no quarrel with such people, but I wish to say that if people really believe that this Bill is going to do some good they cannot but oppose the amendment before us.”

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—“Sir, I am not at all sorry that the hon. the Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment that I proposed. But what I really regret is that so early in the discussion of the Bill the hon. the Minister has exhibited more temper than sound argument. I shall reply to the arguments that the hon. the Minister has chosen to advance against my amendment.”

“If I understood him correctly—he may correct me if he pleases—there were two arguments that he advanced: one was that the reasons that I gave were absurd, because my asking for the postponement of the coming into operation of this Bill was similar to asking for the postponement of the Government of India Act being brought into operation; and secondly, that it was a piece of obstructionist tactics.

“Taking the first argument every one of us who believed in the Government of India Bill did consider that it was a long-delayed measure, that the country wanted it badly and none too soon, and therefore the opinion of every one who believed in the Reforms Scheme was that there ought to be no delay whatever in its introduction. I may, therefore, say, Sir, that there is no analogy between that Bill and the present one. If the hon. Member had chosen to follow my arguments, he would have found that one of the points that I begged to press upon the Council was this, that so far as the working of the present University is concerned it is considered to be efficient to the extent that is possible to-day. It is not therefore any crying evil that you

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar]

[30th January 1923]

Clause 1—cont.

ask now to be remedied, but it is a better measure to be brought into force, and unless you are sure that the measure to be brought into force is in a position to do all the good that is expected of it, it would be unwise to bring that measure into force. The absurdity, therefore, Sir, lies not in asking the bringing into operation of this Bill to be postponed, but in thinking that there is any analogy between this Act and the Government of India Act.

“The next point that the hon. the Minister made was this, that it is a piece of obstructionist tactics. Well, I wish to examine that position a little closely. What does it mean? It means that the Bill will be on the Statute; only, it will come into force three years hence. That there is some good which the Bill is capable of bringing into effect and that that will be postponed for the period for which the operation of this Bill is proposed to be postponed are obvious. But how it is an obstructionist tactics I fail to see. It can only be in this way. Supposing my amendment is accepted, the particular Government to work it will not be this Government; but it will be another Government. My hon. friend may or may not be a Member of that Government. Unless it be that he has so little faith in the measure that if he is not here, it will not be possible to work it successfully, or unless it be that this measure is not likely to be worked properly in the next Government, I cannot at all understand, Sir, how it can be considered to be in the nature of obstructionist tactics.

“My hon. friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, said that I did not like the Bill and that I had therefore put in this motion. I am afraid my hon. friend has not done me justice. As a matter of fact I like the Bill and I will most enthusiastically welcome its introduction even now if I am only satisfied that the Government have enough funds at their disposal to give effect adequately to the various provisions of this Bill. It is because I feel, Sir, and I am sure I am not singular in that belief; even the hon. the Minister, I take it, will agree with me in that—it is because I feel that the Government is not capable of putting at the disposal of the University, or of the proper authorities, the necessary funds to enable them to work this measure successfully, I say that some interval of time should be given to help the Government to gather more funds and to give other institutions, which are now apprehending that they will suffer, enough time to adjust their own position so that they may not have to stand in need of Government support as they do at present.

“Then I was told, Sir, that there are transitory provisions which offer a sufficient safeguard against any harm being done to these institutions. But the House will find that so far as the transitory provisions go, they have really nothing to do with the points that I raised in my opening remarks. They merely refer to the bringing into existence of regulations and also to making some provisions with respect to students who are studying for the examinations. Therefore, I submit, Sir, that the transitory provisions are of no real help on the points that I suggested. But the House will recognize that the Bill even as it stands does contemplate some kind of interval taking place between the passing of this measure into law and the provisions of the Bill being brought into force. If that is the case, I fail to see why such a moderate limit as three years should not be considered to be acceptable for the purpose of fixing what that interval is.”

30th January 1923]

Clause 1—cont.

The amendment was then put to the House and declared lost. On the motion of Diwan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar a poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

1. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu.
2. „ L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar.
3. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.

4. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaachari.
5. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.
6. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar.
7. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyar.
8. „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
9. „ M. Suryanarayana.

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.
2. „ Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur.
3. „ the Raja of Panagal.
4. „ Rai Bahadur K. Venkatareddi Nayudu.
5. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.
6. Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar.
7. „ E. S. Lloyd.
8. The Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail.
9. Mr. R. G. Grieve.
10. Rao Bahadur K. Ramunni Menon.
11. Mr. E. F. Thomas.
12. „ E. Periyaragalam.
13. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.
14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
15. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.
16. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.
17. „ K. Adinarayana Reddi.
18. S. R. Y. Ankinadu Prasad Bahadur.
19. Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu.
20. „ R. Appaswami Nayudu.
21. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandyar.
22. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar.
23. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
24. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Iyagaraya Chettiyar.
25. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.
26. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
27. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.
28. Diwan Bahadur T. Sivagnanam Pillai.
29. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikaachala Chettiyar.
30. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
31. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya.
32. Mr. K. Gopala Menon.
33. „ J. Kuppuswami.
34. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu.
35. „ P. C. Muttu Chettiyar.
36. „ A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.

37. Mr. K. Narayanaswami Reddi.
38. Rao Bahadur O. Natesa Mudaliyar.
39. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai.
40. „ C. Ponnuswami Nayudu.
41. „ P. T. Rajan.
42. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.
43. Mr. W. P. A. Saindarapandiya Nadar.
44. „ R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.
45. „ K. Sitarama Reddi.
46. „ S. Somasundaram Pillai.
47. „ A. Subbarayudu.
48. „ P. Subbarayan.
49. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu.
50. Mr. A. Tangavelu Mayagar.
51. „ V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.
52. „ C. Venkata Ranga Reddi.
53. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai.
54. Mr. P. Siva Rao.
55. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.
56. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachari.
57. The Rev. W. Meston.
58. Mr. S. Arpudasingami Udayar.
59. „ T. Arumainatha Pillai.
60. „ A. T. Palmer.
61. „ M. Ratnaswami.
62. „ A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
63. Sri Mekha V. Apparao Bahadur.
64. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.
65. „ A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.
66. „ Saiyid Ibrahim Ravattar.
67. „ Ahmad Miran Sahib.
68. Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib.
69. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
70. Saiyid Diwan Abdur-Razaq Sahib.
71. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib.
72. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.
73. Mr. R. T. Kesavalu Pillai.
74. „ C. Venkatarangayya.

The motion was lost, 9 voting for it and 74 against.

Clause 1 was then put and passed and added to the Bill.

[30th January 1923]

Clause 2.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" Mr. President,— Before I formally move the amendment standing against my name, which is to the following effect :—

10. (i) *Insert the following (the existing sub-clause (e)) as sub-clause (a) :—*

(a) ' *Limits of the University* ' means the territory within a radius of ten miles from Fort St. George.

(ii) *Re-letter the existing sub-clauses (a), (b), (c) & (d).*

I shall be thankful to you if you will be pleased to give me your opinion on one point, whether my moving this amendment will debar me, if the decision on it is adverse, from moving amendment No. 20 on the ground that the same matter has already been settled. I venture to think that it will not, because this relates only to the position of the clause, while the other relates to the subject-matter. But at the same time I should be thankful to have your ruling, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I cannot give a ruling in advance. Each member must make up his own mind and take his chance.

3-15 p.m.

I am sure that the hon. Member is so careful that he is not likely to make a mistake. The chances are that he is right. I can really give no ruling now."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" I thank you, Sir, for the compliment, and I take it that the chances are that I shall have the chance. The reason for my amendment is this. If the hon. Members will be pleased to glance at definitions (a) and (b) in clause 2, they will see that those definitions contain the expression 'limits of the University'. Does not the expression anticipate the definition of the 'limits of the University'? I think, it will be a more logical and natural order that we should place sub-clause (e) at the head of the series of definitions and then introduce that expression in the subsequent definitions. In other words, the definitions (a) and (b) anticipate the definition that the limit of the University means the territory within a radius of ten miles. Though the heading of the amendment calls it a new sub-clause, it is not a new sub-clause. With this explanation, Sir, I beg to move the amendment."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I second it."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I agree with the mover that the place assigned to the definition of 'limits of the University' does not look so reasonable. But the Bill is likely to be different from what is likely to be quite reasonable. The definitions are arranged in alphabetical order for the purpose of convenient reference. This is how these definitions are arranged in other Acts also, and this has been done only in accordance with the practice in every other Act. Hence the definitions are in alphabetical order."

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The following amendments of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu were deemed to have been withdrawn as the hon. Member did not move them :—

11. *Omit the words 'or recognized'.*

30th January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

12. *Omit the words 'in accordance with the provisions of this Act in which instruction is provided under prescribed conditions'.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I move—

13. *Omit all the words occurring after the word 'conditions'.*

"In doing so, Sir, I beg to make this observation. A Constituent College, as it is stated here, should first provide instruction under prescribed conditions and, secondly, it should be situated within the limits of the University. I dare say there are at present several colleges in the mufassal which are well equipped. Such colleges must certainly be admitted into the portals of the University. They must be developed on up-to-date lines, so that when the time comes they may form nuclei of future universities—one for the Andhras, one for the Tamilians and one for the West Coast. When the time comes they must be selected and recognized as distinct Universities. This Bill cannot be considered to be wholesome and complete without such provisions made in it. With these few words, I propose the amendment."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I second it."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Hon. Members will realize that one of the fundamental principles of this Bill is to form a Teaching University in the city of Madras and have the colleges within it as Constituent Colleges. If sub-clause (b) were to be amended as suggested, it would mean that colleges outside Madras should also be called Constituent Colleges. This is going against the fundamental principle of the Bill. I quite agree that there are colleges doing good work in the mufassal. But I say that the provisions of the Bill are only transitory, and there are provisions in it to develop such institutions so that, in course of time, they may become centres of the university and become Constituent Colleges of new universities. This amendment is opposed to the fundamental principle of the Bill."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I think the best way of dealing with this question would be to allow my friend to withdraw this motion and to allow the discussion as to whether the scope of the Bill should be extended as proposed by my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, in amendment No. 17. That raises the question as to whether the University as defined here should be within the ten-mile limit and whether some attempt should not be made to include colleges outside as 'University Colleges'. Under these circumstances, I would request my friend not to press his amendment at this stage. The whole question would be discussed under the amendment of Mr. Venkataratnam."

The amendment was then by leave withdrawn.

The following amendments of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu were deemed to have been withdrawn as the hon. Member did not move them :—

14. *Omit the words 'which is'.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

15. *Add at the end the following :—*

'or recognized by the University in accordance with the provisions of this Act in which instruction is provided under prescribed conditions.'

[30th January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

The following amendment of Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharlu was deemed to have been withdrawn as the hon. Member did not move it :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHAACHARLU :—

16. *Add at the end the following :—*

‘ or, being situated within those limits, is declared and constituted by the Senate as a Constituent College.’

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu was then called upon to move amendment No. 17.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ Mr. President, after the information or explanation of the hon. Minister, I do not know if this amendment should come as clause (m) or (n). But if I am permitted to move it at this stage, I shall do so.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ You can move it. Amendments must be moved according to their order in the agenda paper.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ I did not want to be told that it was not in proper order. So, I wanted to make myself clear. I beg to move this amendment, Sir :

17. (i) *Insert the following as sub-clause (c) :—*

‘ (c) “ *University College* ” means a college recognized by the University, under conditions prescribed therefor, for doing higher teaching and research work and promoting University life in such a manner as to prepare for the institution of a new University.’

(ii) *Re-letter the subsequent sub-clauses.*

Hon. Members, if they turned to the Preamble, would be pleased to observe that one of the objects of the Bill is to prepare for the institution of new Universities. How are we to do it? What are the measures to be adopted? What are the stages which this process of preparation has to go through? It would not be possible obviously to start a new University straight off at any particular time. Preparation will have to be made for it. Such a preparation I propose to suggest through a college which might, in view of this ultimate object, be named a ‘ University College’. In the definition, as I suggest, there is a distinct reference made to this object, namely, the preparation of new Universities. The qualifications necessary to get recognized as preparing for the institution of a new University I have also endeavoured to indicate : that is, doing higher teaching and research work and promoting University life. That such higher teaching and research work are being done and the promotion of University life is being promoted could not be claimed by self, but it should be recognized under certain conditions by the University. Ultimately therefore it rests with the University to state whether or not a certain college has satisfied the conditions pre-requisite to the institution of a new University. Unless such institutions are fostered, unless, as has been suggested, such seedlings are planted here and there in the country, it will not be possible eventually to get fully developed new Universities. That there is the need for new Universities is recognized on all hands. These new Universities alone can take away those disabilities of the mufassal colleges that are

30th January 1923] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

Clause 2—cont.

going to be so heavily imposed by the present reorganization of the University. Secondly, Sir, in order expressly to re-assure other centres than the Madras City that Government and the University do contemplate the formation of the nuclei of universities and thus the institution of new universities from the very beginning, it is necessary, I venture to submit, that a definition like this one should be introduced in clause 2. As to any possible objections I shall try to express my views when the occasion arises for a reply. But I do believe that none of the so-called principles of the Bill will in the least be affected, and none of the objects of the University Bill will in the least be hindered by the introduction of this definition. On the other hand I am satisfied that its introduction will really supply an omission. It is, indeed, the recognition of one of the declared objects, as an essential feature, of this Bill. Sir, I beg leave to move this amendment."

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—"I second this amendment, and, in doing so, I have to point out that it is one of the objects of this Bill that the Senate shall at the end of five years, after passing this Act, submit a report to the local Government on the condition of Affiliated Colleges and on the desirability or otherwise of establishing other universities outside the limits of the university. That object will be achieved, in a large measure, by offering means for colleges doing higher teaching and research work and promoting university life in such a manner as to prepare for the institution of new universities. Coming from Trichinopoly, which one of my hon. friends characterized as one of the disgruntled stations, I must point out that the feeling in the mufassal is very strong that the present University Bill will make mufassal colleges third rate or fourth rate colleges, and that the education imparted in these colleges will not be considered to be on a level with that imparted in presidency towns. With these words, I second the amendment."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Sir, this, I submit, is one of the most important amendments with which the House will have to deal, and I may briefly state the reasons why it should be utterly unacceptable to this House. One of the objects of the Bill, we all admit, is to produce a state of conditions or circumstances under which it will be possible for more universities to be developed in the mufassal. The only point is whether you are going to gain this object by means of this definition and any consequential provisions which will have to be made. I entirely agree with my hon. friend Sir Desika Achariyar when he reads out that it will be one of the functions of the Senate to report at the end of five years from the passing of this Bill :

On the condition of Affiliated Colleges and on the desirability or otherwise of establishing other universities outside the limits of the university.

Deliberately the function of choosing such centres has been left in the hands of the Government. I consider the Government to be the only proper authority for that purpose. If we now accept this definition what will be the consequence? We shall be investing in the existing University powers for forming other universities.

University College means a college recognized by the University.

Therefore, the initiative in this matter would rest with the University and the University will be able to say which college is going to develop as

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[30th January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

the centre of another university. It seems to me that this is taking away a very important power of the Government and vesting it in a body which, as I shall presently show, is not fit to be entrusted with that power.

Promoting university life in such a manner as to prepare for the institution of a new University.

The language is very ambiguous. Is it the intention of this definition that the particular college recognized should be the University of the future? If so, you will be inflicting a great deal of hardship and injustice on other colleges which may be in the same locality. I wish to draw the attention of this Council to this important difference between a University College and a University Centre. We have to develop centres like Trichinopoly into universities not merely by recognizing a single college thereof as the one which ought to become a university, but by recognizing all the colleges there as Constituent Colleges of future universities and affording facilities for higher instruction and research. Let us not be misled that by approving this amendment we shall be realizing this object. If this amendment is carried, other colleges will put their applications and exert their influence for being recognized as University Colleges. It will amount to an injustice to the other colleges in the same locality.

"Again, the amendment if accepted will result in the far more serious consequence of the Government being precluded from organizing facilities independently of the existing colleges. A mufassal university does not mean an existing mufassal college which should be developed into an university. It might mean a mufassal centre in which other changes might take place. Then, Sir, there is the question of grants. This is a matter of vast importance. Is this power going to be taken by the University? Already members from the mufassal consider that this is going to be the enemy of the mufassal colleges and mufassal aspirations. In one breath they distrust the Madras University and in the other breath they ask it to take the initiative in developing mufassal colleges into universities. Viewed from any point of view, I believe that this definition and the whole of the machinery which underlies it is unfit to realize our object. The present provision says that the Senate shall at the end of five years from the passing of this Act report to the Government as to what institutions or localities should be chosen or selected for the foundation of new universities. We are not concerned here with the developing of a single college into a university. We are more concerned with centres or localities rather than single colleges and after that Government will take action and give the necessary financial assistance. For all these reasons, I feel that this amendment cannot be accepted."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Mr. President, Sir, I strongly support this amendment. My reasons are very simple. In the Preamble it is stated as one of the objects of this Bill

that it is desirable by the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching and research at suitable centres outside the limits of the University to prepare for the institution of new universities!

I take it, Sir, that the amendment now before the House will be in consonance with the object that is in the Preamble. I fail to note, Sir, how else it is possible to carry out this object unless from the beginning we recognize

30th January 1923]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

Clause 2—cont.

certain colleges as University Colleges, colleges which should develop higher training and research and be earmarked as University Colleges—as deserving special attention at the hands of the University. Now, this proposal is not new. It does not emanate from my hon. friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu. It is one of the proposals made by the Calcutta University Commission itself. It is stated there :

In order to encourage the growth of colleges which may be capable of becoming potential universities, such colleges should, on fulfilling certain definite conditions, receive the rank of University Colleges,

and so on. It is also provided that additional funds may be necessary in the case of such colleges.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I request my friend to note whether that power of recognition is vested in the University or in the Government. Here the word ‘recognized’ is used and ‘recognized’ means recognized by the Senate or the University.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“ I may say, Sir, that the power of recognizing as a University College rests with the University and the power of converting it into a university rests with the Government. I do not think it is open for one university to recommend the formation of another university. All that it can say is that a certain college is in a certain unique position and it deserves to be ranked as a University College and that it is likely to become a potential centre for a future university ; but the final stage rests with the Government. Then my friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, said that the amendment seeks to transfer the power from the Government to the Senate. I do not think that by passing this amendment we shall be transferring the privilege or the monopoly from the Government to the Senate or the University. It should be open to the framers of this Bill to mark certain colleges as deserving of special treatment from the beginning, so that they may become potential centres of future universities. With these remarks, I heartily support the amendment.”

Rev. Dr. E. M. MACPHAIL :—“ Mr. President, Sir, Mr. Siva Rao has referred to the Calcutta University Commission’s Report ; and I am afraid that in this discussion and in the discussions that have gone before, Members have been influenced in their interpretation of this Bill by dim recollections of that report. It will be remembered by those who have read the report that the Calcutta University Commission divided the colleges of Calcutta city into two classes according to merit, and recommended that certain of those colleges which were found to be good should be called Constituent Colleges and certain others which were bad should remain for the time being as Affiliated Colleges until their future was decided. Now, in this Bill there is not a single attempt made to discriminate between the quality of colleges. It has been suggested that we ought to have done that. I think that the framers of this Bill were extremely wise in not attempting to do anything of the kind. It is far better, it seems to me, to carry out the distinct principle which has been already enunciated. We are going to attempt to establish local universities. I quite wish, as I have already stated to the hon. Minister in charge, that in the Preamble of the Bill that fact had

[Rev. Dr. E. M. Macphail]

[30th January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

been put first and foremost—that the object of the Bill was to establish local universities throughout the Madras Presidency and that those local universities should take the place of the University of Madras which has been doing good work but which has become somewhat unwieldy. It is because the Bill attempts to do that that I am supporting it. I should deprecate entirely the idea of this Bill drawing any distinction between colleges and saying that some are good and some are bad. Now, the Member who is proposing this amendment is bringing in a new element altogether. He wants that we should stigmatize certain colleges by putting them into a class different from others. If we had divided the Madras colleges into those which are constituent and those which are not worthy to be constituent, there might be some excuse for this. But I consider that we should be acting unwisely and should be imposing an extremely invidious task upon the Senate of the new university by asking them to decide which colleges are to be treated as University Colleges and which not.

“All through Dr. Rama Rao's speech, there has been the idea that
3-45 p.m. ‘constituent colleges’ confers a higher grade upon certain colleges, that it marks with approval the work that they have done and that ‘Affiliated Colleges’ marks with disapproval the work that these have done. That is altogether a mistake. There has been no attempt at anything of the kind. With regard to Mr. Siva Rao's observation about the proposal that there should be University Colleges, if he has read that report carefully through, he will remember that one thing which runs through the whole of the Calcutta University Report with regard to the mufassal colleges is that they are second rate, that they are not fit to compete with the Calcutta colleges, that they are in an inferior position and therefore require inferior examinations. Now, Sir, I do not think that is true of Madras colleges. I have visited practically every college in the Presidency more than once and I maintain that our mufassal colleges are doing extremely good work and that some of them are doing just as good work as any college in Madras. Therefore I say we are not in the same position as Calcutta where colleges have to be worked up by encouraging them with honorary designations.

“There is only one other remark that I wish to make before I sit down, that is, that I deprecate altogether the idea, as Mr. Ramalinga Reddi has done, that we should seek to develop unitary universities in the mufassal, in Madura, Trichinopoly or Malabar. Whatever centre may be chosen, my desire is to see universities established which shall be like the university of Madras containing different colleges, not of the unitary type, but containing different colleges some of which will be working for Honours and some others working for the ordinary Pass Degree. I think therefore it would be a mistake if we at this stage were to commit ourselves, as we practically should be doing, to saying that some colleges are not worthy of being treated as parts of the University.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—“If I understand the hon. Member for the University correctly, his position is that it is the function of the Government to select the University Centre in the mufassal and such a

30th January 1923] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

Clause 2—cont.

function shall not be delegated to the Senate or Syndicate. I respectfully draw his attention to clause 27, sub-clause (f). It is printed in bold type and it runs thus :

“... in consultation with the colleges concerned to prepare and lay before the Syndicate plans for the concentration and co-ordination of resources for higher teaching and research and for the promotion of university life at suitable centres . . .

Here, the selection of the centre is given not to the Senate but to the Syndicate. The recommendations should go from the Affiliated Colleges to the Syndicate, and the Syndicate will then correspond with the Government as to the future line of action. So there is no harm if we accept this amendment of Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I am sorry I am not able to follow Dr. Macphail in the argument that he has advanced against this amendment. It is said that we should not differentiate between one college and another in the mufassal, that they should all be on one level and that we are to divide them according to localities. The whole frame of the Bill is this. We are beginning with a university here and in future we are to have universities in selected places. How are you going to select these centres unless you find out whether education in a particular locality or centre is efficient or not? It may be that you have indifferent first-grade colleges in a certain place and very good institutions in another. Unless you recognize the fact that one institution is better than another and concentrate attention on the good one, how can you attain the standard of a university? It will be absolutely impossible. The very frame of the Bill recognizes our constant attention being paid to certain localities to develop the institutions there. Otherwise it will be impossible to have these local universities in the near future. So, Sir, I am unable to follow the reasoning of Dr. Macphail. His argument will only mean leaving everything alone, with the inevitable result that you won't be able to bring about any university in future. Unless certain centres are developed, unless the institutions in these centres are made efficient, I do not see, Sir, how you can in future bring into existence any new university.

“With regard to the present motion, I have one difficulty. Take, for instance, a place like Trichinopoly. If you are going to have a University College recognized there, what will become of other institutions? Close by Trichinopoly, we have Chidambaram and Madura. If you are going to have one college in Trichinopoly and develop it into a university, I am certain that it will not be possible to develop a university at Madura or Chidambaram. My idea of future local universities is that you should club together two or three places like Trichinopoly and Madura and have one university for these places. It will not do either to starve out Madura or to recognize only one institution, even in a place like Trichinopoly, and let others go to rack and ruin. So far as the conditions in our Presidency are concerned, the only line of policy will be not to concentrate attention on one particular institution but on one particular locality. The locality may cover an area of even 100 miles. It does not matter. You must concentrate your attention on that particular locality so as to make the institutions there efficient, with a view to the constitution of a university in that locality. That seems to be the only course of development in our country. So, it

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [30th January 1923]

Clause 2—cont.

seems to me that the definition that is proposed by my revered friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, does not go far enough. It only proposes to recognize particular institutions. As I said, the inevitable result of that will be that other institutions in that very centre may have to suffer, and our constitution of a new university will also suffer. So, I ask whether it will not be better to introduce another definition which will take in all the institutions of a particular locality. That will be very good. I would earnestly request him to consider that matter, and if he does, I shall be very glad to support an amendment like that; for it is absolutely necessary that we should concentrate attention on particular localities so that we may have centres like Madras."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"Mr. President, merely as a matter of drafting let me point out to the House that assuming that this definition of a University College is accepted, I do not find from a review of the motions tabled by my hon. friend, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, that there is anything in the structural portions of the Bill itself which will carry out the idea sought to be suggested by this motion. I take it that the result of carrying this amendment will be to have three classes of institutions instead of two, viz., Constituent Colleges, University Colleges and Affiliated colleges. The mode of developing all these University Colleges, whether they ought to be in line with the Constituent Colleges or the Affiliated Colleges and in what manner they should function, is not set forth in the Bill itself. That is a matter which I felt it my duty to bring to the notice of the House."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"I am sorry I am not able to lay my finger on any particular amendments. However, there are some amendments notified by me, indicating in one place that the Academic Council and in another place that the Council of Affiliated Colleges, will be empowered to lay down the conditions."

Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"What I was saying was not that my hon. friend has not indicated certain further functions as appurtenant to the colleges, but the way in which they are to carry out the instructions is not indicated in the Bill nor are the ideals clearly defined in the Bill."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"Mr. President, Sir, with all due deference to the hon. Member who moved this amendment and other hon. Members who may move similar amendments, may I venture to place before them just a few points? May I say that the reorganization of the university consists chiefly in making the university a teaching and residential university in the strict sense of the two words. At least, that is the aim regarding which, I believe there are no two opinions, as far as I can see. If this is the aim, there is no meaning in trying to make the university comprise a whole area many times larger than the British Isles. Therefore, the ten-mile limit is about the most that can be provided for realising the ideal. Secondly, the affiliating function of the Madras University, with all its ugly features, is only a temporary one. By strenuous effort and concentration of resources, we should try to establish other universities in other centres. In my opinion, the time has come for the starting of other universities. In the meanwhile, the Madras University is forced, as it were, to perform these functions of affiliation, and I have no

30th January 1923]

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

Clause 2—cont.

doubt it will do it with a liberal spirit trying to overcome all temptations towards step-motherly treatment of the mufassal colleges. It ought for example to send University Professors to lecture in mufassal colleges. It may also induce mufassal students to come to Madras to attend lectures, if it is feasible. The third thing that has to be borne in mind is that in a Bill for the reorganization of a particular university, there is absolutely no use of including clauses that foreshadow the starting of future universities. I say there is no use. This clause may be introduced, but it will not serve the purpose of founding a new university, which does not lie with the University but with the Government. Therefore, Sir, I oppose this amendment."

This Council adjourned at 4 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on the 31st January 1923.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,

Secretary to the Legislative Council.

